THEOLOGY

VOL. LXIII AUGUST, 1960 No. 482

Editorial

A LEARNED monograph on the exegesis of Romans 13. 1–7, entitled *The Powers that be* by Clinton Morrison (S.C.M. Press, 9s. 6d.), has just appeared. Mr Morrison begins by explaining the interpretation of this passage which has in recent times been put forward by Dr Oscar Cullmann and others: the view, namely, that Paul held political authorities to be the terrestrial counterpart of heavenly powers that had been brought into subjection to Christ's kingdom. He goes on to show what objections have been raised against that view by other scholars. Then for his own part he looks at the evidence in a wider context and is led to cross-bench conclusions. It seems to us that he makes out his case. Anyhow, no one should henceforth attempt to expound Romans 13 or to base a theological structure upon it without having weighed Mr Morrison's arguments. But as regards a Christian doctrine of the state, we do not think there is any need to modify Dr Bennett's conclusion in the book we noticed last month: "The most we can learn from the New Testament is that there must be political authority, that the Christian should take a positive attitude toward the order-creating functions of civil government because in and through them the providence of God is at work in preserving the essential conditions for human life, and that the state should be kept in bounds and not be allowed to usurp the place of God" (p. 35).

* * * * *

We wish to remind contributors to THEOLOGY of what we wrote in May 1958: "Since a substantial proportion of the readers of THEOLOGY are laymen who have not had reason to study ancient languages, we have devised the following maxim for our contributors. When they have occasion to make quotations in Greek, Latin, etc.—which they are quite at liberty to do—they are asked in future to translate the quotation in the text of the article (or letter or book review, as the case may be) and to place the original language in a footnote or alternatively within brackets. This arrangement should facilitate wider readability without in any way lowering the standards of learning that we seek to maintain."

* * * * *

Autres temps autres mœurs. "FEMALE PREACHERS. SIR,—Can you or any of your correspondents afford a clue as to the religious sects who do, and those who do not, admit of female preaching? Women oratory, among the Quakers, is a very common, indeed general, case; but beyond their prayerless, praiseless assemblies, I think examples of this sort are rare. By the way, I once remember an unmarried (!)

lady being placarded to play the priest at a Baptist meeting-house in a retired part of the country; and in some instances the Methodists allow women to speak.

"As a matter of discipline, nothing throughout the marzes of dissent appears more untenable, more scripturally unlawful . . .

"Female preaching is even a libel on that privacy observed in all other respects in civil society. It would be an anomaly, were a lady to intrude upon the platform of politics, or take part in a public address! And what would be our astonishment to hear of female lecturing on any branch of the secular sciences!

"I remain, Sir, Yours,

"A Lancashire Subscriber."

—*The Church Magazine,* December 1840, pp. 378 f.

An English College of Preachers: the Story of a Beginning

Most readers will have heard of the Washington College of Preachers of which until recently the well-known theological writer, Dr Theodore Wedel, was Warden, and some will actually have participated in one of its training courses. It was with this model before them, though with no intention of slavish imitation, that a reasonably representative selection of Christians were invited together recently to discuss the desirability of something analogous in England. The convener was the Bishop of Bradford, Dr Donald Coggan, the rendezvous the well-known Quaker centre, Old Jordans, in Buckinghamshire, and the date 28–29 March 1960. Interestingly enough, it was only shortly before that, quite independently, the *Church Times* had copied, from *Westcott House Chronicle,* a remark by Dr John Habgood, the Vice-Principal of Westcott House, Cambridge, stressing the urgent need for a College of Preachers.

The group was, to be sure, a predominantly Anglican one, and largely clerical at that. But those who fell outside the one or the other of these categories were of a quality and authority to compensate for their fewness: the Bishop's wife (Mrs Coggan), a celebrated translator of German theology (Dr Olive Wyon), a medical man with missionary experience and psychiatric practice (Dr Frank Lake), an industrialist (Mr Ernest Shippam), and two Headmasters (Mr R. J. Knight and Mr D. R. Wigram). The clergy were, besides the Bishop of Bradford: the Revs A. J. W. Barker, D. W. Cleverley Ford, H. Frankham, and S. M. Gibbard, S.S.J.E., Canons Bryan Green and G. W. Ireson, Professor G.W. H. Lampe, the Rev. R. M. W. Marsh, Professor C. F. D. Moule, the Very Rev. G. Reindorp, the Revs G. J. Rogers and Canon E. Southcott, the Venerable Archdeacon R. G. Strutt, and the Rev. Canon M. A. C. Warren.

What follows is intended to be in the main a narrative of the

conference. It is left to the reader to imagine the sense of excitement and the conviction that the Holy Spirit was leading us, as the need, the possibilities, and the plan of action unfolded. It seemed to the writer one of the most momentous gatherings he had ever attended.

Under the genial but firmly business-like chairmanship of Bishop Coggan, discussion moved rapidly forward. The first question debated was whether there was in fact a place and a need for courses of intensive training in the art of preaching. As the discussion developed, it became very clear not only that there was a desperate need for this sort of training, but also that it was possible to receive, in the course of it, infinitely more than merely instruction on sermon-making. It was the testimony of all who had had any experience of Washington that it may be the source of new vision and hope and of the quickening of spiritual life for many who have lost heart and come near to despair. As Dr Wedel puts it in an article, "Coming into judgment is at the same time entrance into grace. Judgment means that someone takes our feelings seriously. Someone cares. A Christian fellowship cares. . . . Despite the sting of shamed pride, joy in experiencing a fellowship of the Holy Spirit—an experience all too rare even for those in priest's orders—turns some of these sermon disciplines into hotbeds of charity." What gripped and held the imagination of the company most of all was probably precisely this realization that here were new possibilities for vitality and vision in the ministry—the ministry which is so often endangered by loneliness and despair. Many of us already knew the value of "refresher courses", and clergy are frequently told that they make too little use of them. But here was the prospect of refresher courses with a difference—refresher courses, as it were, with "expression work"; and it did not require even acquaintance with the Washington College to grasp that there is nothing like actually working together at a great task, with uninhibited mutual criticism and free experiment, in the atmosphere of Christian fellowship and corporate prayer, to bring new strength and hope.

By now, therefore, we were unanimous about the need and the possibilities. It was less clear whether the courses should be begun on an interdenominational basis—even an ecumenical basis (and Dr Wedel was known to be coming to England at such a time as to make some personal contact possible). Some were eager to seize an interdenominational opportunity forthwith; but the majority felt that there was more hope of success in starting within the Anglican Church, and indeed within the ranks of the clergy, although with the expectation of broadening out eventually. In any case, it would be possible from the first to invite distinguished visitors from oversea to give some of the lectures.

The actual character of the courses was next discussed. To many it was clear that it is impossible to *preach* a "specimen" sermon. Preaching is an activity, in the context of prayer and evangelism, which presupposes a real situation and real needs, not an artificially arranged group of critics; and fortunate are those Theological Colleges (even if not those congregations which are involved) where men

in training are able to gain practice and be criticized by their teachers and colleagues in the context of normal Sunday worship in neighbouring churches. But even if preaching in the strict sense is impossible on a course, the technique of preaching may certainly be studied, illustrated, and practised;[1] the theology of preaching and the theology preached may be discussed; and great gain may result —as has been said already—from the group-sharing of mutual criticism and the corporate quest for improvement in this ministry.

It was agreed, therefore, that a practical possibility might be courses each comprising three full days—a Monday evening to a Friday morning—in which would be included Bible readings, lectures on some great theological theme, lectures on the methods and techniques of preaching it, and practical experiment in the composition and delivery of sermons.

By this time it had become obvious to all except the Chairman that the Bishop of Bradford was himself the right person to elect as spokesman and sponsor of the venture, and he was duly appointed Chairman of the College of Preachers. Mr Cleverley Ford, the Vicar of Holy Trinity with All Saints, South Kensington, was, to his unfeigned surprise, presented by the unanimous wish of all others present (knowing him as a writer on the subject and as himself an outstanding preacher) with the arduous responsibility of becoming Director; and it was arranged, by the kindness of the Warden and Assistant Warden of Scargill House (the Revs A. J. W. Barker and R. M. W. Marsh), that the first courses should be held there, although the hope was expressed that eventually permanent quarters might be found—possibly in the Midlands. Scargill House, in the Yorkshire dales, is rapidly becoming known as the northern equivalent (roughly speaking) of Lee Abbey in Devon; and it will make a glorious setting for the beginnings of the venture, with the Warden and Assistant Warden themselves acting as members of staff for the College of Preachers.

It was agreed to begin with two courses in 1960—7–11 and 14–18 November—and to plan for several more in 1961. The intention was to invite visiting lecturers and leaders to deliver the lectures and to lead the practice-groups; and to build the first course round the theme of the Cross and the second round the theme of the Holy Spirit.

The selection of participants and the question of finance occupied the last part of the discussion. It was decided to begin by approaching a limited number of dioceses, as a "pilot scheme", asking their bishops to nominate clergy, of not less than seven years' standing in the ministry, to be invited to the courses. The aim was to have, say, thirty-six on each course—a multiple of six for easy subdivision into practice-groups. As for finance, the school would need, at least at first, to be self-supporting and participants would therefore have to

[1] While participants will not be expected to preach a sermon before others *as if they were in church*, it is hoped that they will read or "re-present" an actual sermon which they have previously preached.

pay fees; but it was hoped that bishops might see their way to using diocesan funds in cases of need, and that inquiry by certain members of the conference might point the way to raising a sufficient sum for ultimate endowment. A donation of £50 was promised during the conference. Further donations will be gratefully received by the Director, the Rev. D. W. Cleverley Ford, 4, Cambridge Place, London, W.8.

Finally, it need hardly be said that all members of the conference recognized that preaching (in the normally accepted sense) is only one part—and sometimes a comparatively small part—of the vast task of "communication". But it was believed that to concentrate on making preaching effective and real would be an important way in to all sorts of other aspects of the most thrilling of all activities—the sharing of the gospel. Much will now depend upon the prayerful help of participants and interested readers.

C. F. D. Moule.

Anglican Ascetical Theology, 1939-60

If a cynic was invited to survey the development of Anglican ascetical theology over the past twenty-one years, he might be tempted to reply that there has not been any. But that would be a superficial judgment which failed properly to appreciate the significance of the subject. It is true that few important books with the word "ascetical" on their title pages have appeared since the early nineteen-thirties, and there are no obvious successors to those writers of this period whose names are immediately associated with the subject: Oscar Hardman, F. P. Harton, Evelyn Underhill, Bede Frost, C. F. Rogers and H. S. Box.

But ascetical theology is both a subject and a method of theological thinking. By traditional definition, it is that branch of spiritual theology which deals with the elementary stages of the Christian life, formed and nurtured by prayer and the practical disciplines which attend it; it is the study of the soul's early progress towards perfection, of the purgative way, of discursive and acquired prayer. But it is also concerned with the application of doctrine to pastoral method, which is likely to overlap, first into moral and liturgical studies, and ultimately into all other branches of divine learning. Seen in this way, my supposed cynic must be asked to think again. In other words, we must distinguish between "ascetical-theology", as a specific subject, and "*ascetical* theology" as a method or approach; between the substantive and adjectival uses of this word. That St Augustine opposed the Pelagians is history; the doctrine he wrote against them is dogmatics; the practical implications of this doctrine—that the first Christian duty is to seek and co-operative with Grace by disciplined prayer—is ascetical theology. If we approach our studies in this way, and carry them to this kind of conclusion without getting bogged down in "historical theology", then

we can validly speak of ascetical history and ascetical dogma. It is in this sense that I think most progress has been made during the period under review. Countering the meagre output of books on "ascetical-theology", a great many of our leading scholars seem to be approaching their subjects, whatever they may be, in an ascetical way.

If we add the fact that parochial work has run into problems which can be solved only by theological thought and application, then this article naturally divides itself into three main sections. First, I would like to examine the position of ascetical theology in 1939 and to consider some of its developments. Secondly, some attempt must be made at the difficult task of explaining the more general theological trend towards ascetical thinking and, thirdly, the relevance of the present pastoral situation must be looked at. Finally, if ascetical thought is regarded in this way—as "applied" theology—then any survey of the immediate past tends to protrude itself into the future; and one or two speculative pointers towards our future needs in this field may be allowed to conclude this brief survey.

I

It is my guess—I am willing or indeed anxious to be proved in error—that Dr Oscar Hardman's *The Ideals of Asceticism*, published in 1924, was the last strictly ascetical thesis to be approved by an English University for a doctorate in divinity. In 1932 Dr Hardman edited the two-volume symposium *The Christian Life*, and the same year saw the publication of F. P. Harton's *The Elements of the Spiritual Life*. These books were serious attempts, the first for some time, to formulate a comprehensive and systematic Anglican ascetic. Looking back on them to-day produces an interesting paradox, which is partially resolved by the considerations of the next section. On the one hand, these books are everywhere regarded as rather prosaic and out of date: on the other hand they have never been replaced and no attempt has been made to write any worthy successors. Plainly a book cannot become out of date unless the study of its subject has advanced, even if the results of this advance have yet to be written down and printed. Whatever opinion is held about the intrinsic quality of this work by Hardman and Harton, it must be admitted that it served to stimulate interest in ascetics, and that it forms something of a landmark in the progress of ascetical thought within our communion.

By its very nature, successful ascetical theology finds its fullest expression not so much in more ascetical theology, but in deeper and healthier religion. Or, to keep within the bounds of our context, what the serious ascetical scholar writes might fairly be judged by its influence on what the serious layman reads. From this angle, too, the year 1932 appears as a watershed between two distinct eras. Prior to that date it would not be difficult to name several famous and saintly Anglicans whose writings for lay and parochial use were extremely popular. But to be honest, they were more than a little

sentimental, moralistic, and coloured by a rather prim pietism. These little devotional books may have been excellent of their type, but they were not ascetical and to-day they are in less and less demand. Coupled with this trend is what appears to be something of an abatement in the public interest in mysticism, and in the consequent trend towards an unhealthy and uncreative quest for religious emotion. A brilliantly satirical treatment of this attitude by Miss Valerie Pitt (in *Prism,* June 1959) gained far more support than might have been expected, which illustrates a plain trend towards a more sanely ascetical outlook. The layman's manual now speaks less of "devotion" and more of the simple practice of Christian virtue, prayer and practical duty.

Following social and economic trends, a good deal of serious writing is now available in "paper-back" form, and religious publishers like Mowbrays and S.P.C.K. are well to the fore in this field. Thirty years ago it would have been unusual for an Oxford professor to bother with an inexpensive layman's book of sound ascetical instruction, yet that happened in 1957 without comment (V. A. Demant: *A Two-Way Religion*). Writers of the calibre of W. L. Knox, L. W. Grensted, Lindsay Dewar and others, are now available in this form of publication. Perhaps more significant still is the fact that the older "little hints to devotion" type of booklet is rapidly being replaced by excellent translations of the spiritual classics in series by no means confined to popular favourites. Those responsible for the *Fleur de Lys* series, whose translators include a Franciscan and a Wantage Sister, are performing a work of incalculable importance to Anglican spirituality, and indeed to ascetical theology.

This very brief literary survey is completed by the publication, in 1959, of two books of a rather different kind. Fr Gilbert Shaw's *The Face of Love,* and my own *Christian Proficiency* are both of fair bulk and are not especially cheap, yet, while very different in style and content, they both attempt to provide serious ascetics and both presuppose a fairly "advanced" laity. Having reviewed the first book and written the second, I am not disposed to discuss their quality, but it seems not without significance that books of this *type* should be published at all. I very much doubt if either would have been considered, certainly not as valid economic risks, in 1932.

We are approaching the stage when the writer of "popular" religion and the serious scholar cease to be in two distinct classes, and whatever criticism is levelled against the works of those scholars mentioned in my first paragraph, they form the starting point for this new ascetical movement.

II

If *The Ideals of Asceticism* was the last ascetical D.D. thesis, I suspect that *The Vision of God,* only four years later, was the last strictly ascetical series of Bampton Lectures. This leads to another stimulating paradox. Together with others of the period, the former book is somewhat doggedly "academic", which is the last thing one

would expect ascetical theology to be; it is, however, a characteristic one might reasonably expect of Bampton Lectures on the history of the doctrine of man's last end. Yet curiously—at first glance at any rate—when it comes to the practical application of Christian doctrine to everyday religion, the first book is uninspiring and outdated while the second is neither. The first is largely forgotten, while the second is still in constant use by parish clergy and laypeople. The first is very much the D.D. thesis (a copy to be deposited in the university archives), while the second has been reprinted half a dozen times over fifteen years by popular demand. The secret lies not so much in subject matter, nor in scholarship, but in that change of emphasis and approach which we have previously considered, and I suggest that this new era of more general ascetical thinking is directly traceable to Dr Kirk. The earlier writers dealt with ascetical theology in a scholarly way: we are now looking at scholarship in an ascetical way.

This new approach, which is ascetical theology whatever particular subject it deals with, is clearly seen in the liturgical work of A. G. Hebert (*Liturgy and Society*, 1935) and Dom Gregory Dix (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, 1943). None will deny the attributes of sound learning to these works, nor that they are—in the deep, true sense—academic; yet they spontaneously overflow the confines of study and lecture room. Scholarship seems to have opened its pastoral eyes, and that, basically, is what ascetical theology is all about.

Within this general movement a good many more eminent names could be mentioned: Dr W. O. Chadwick, the Bishop of Exeter, the Archbishop of York (*Durham Essays and Addresses*), Professor Demant, Dr A. R. Vidler (*Christian Belief and this World, Essays in Liberality*), Professor Burnaby—these are but a few who are pointing not only at Christian doctrine, but through it to its living religious significance. But within the confines of an article such as this, one can only illustrate the point by lapsing into personal influences, interpretation and choice. And on this arbitrary basis I suggest that one of the most significant books in this respect is Dr E. L. Mascall's *Christ, the Christian and the Church*, first published in 1946. To regard this simply as another, or the latest, or even the best, study of the Incarnation, is to miss two points which make this book such a significant ascetical milestone. First, it consummates the tradition, inaugurated by Dr Kirk, of looking beyond theological facts to their pastoral implications, and it exhibits that synthesis of speculative and affective spirituality, which has been characteristic of English religion since the days of St Anselm. Even without the liberty of my own italics here, the book's sub-title plainly implies this conscious approach: "A study of the Incarnation *and its consequences*." Every page of this learned work breathes a warm pastoral sense, it is domestic rather than donnish, and I hope its author will not misunderstand me when I suggest that parts of it could have been written by a learned Caroline country parson. But the important thing is that this is only an example—though perhaps a very good example—of a discernible trend in theology as a whole.

The second point is contained in the title, and elaborated in the Preface: it exhibits "the Incarnation of the Son of God as the foundation and the unifying principle of the life and thought of both the individual Christian and the Church of which he is a member". This relation and balance between personal duty, prayer and discipline, and all that is implied by loyal churchmanship, is one of the main ascetical questions of the day. The teaching of the nineteen-thirties was inclined to be "academic" because it was individualistic. Reaction against this tendency is seen in the "Parish Communion" movement growing out of the liturgical studies of Fr Hebert and Dom Gregory Dix. But the real need, as Dr Mascall so clearly shows, is not reaction but synthesis: a need which has led me to invent the clumsy, but I think necessary, term—"parochial theology".

III

Ascetics is essentially "occasional" theology, it is what was once so succinctly called "practicall divinitie", which must, by its very nature, have pastoral significance, and a new stimulus to ascetical thought arises out of current pastoral problems. We have noticed that the "Parish Communion" movement is directly connected with liturgical and eucharistic studies, but I think we may be moving into a period when this whole process must be widened out into a more general pastoral application of dogmatics.

Thirty years ago the problems which concerned parish priests and thoughtful laity were evangelistic and sociological. They were interested in wholesale "evangelism" by methods of varying theological integrity, and with "applying Christian principles to social questions" without any very clear idea about what "Christian principles" really were; at least these were not the same as dogmatic theology. These could, of course, be matters of ascetical importance, but they were not regarded in that light, and I hazard the guess that general failure in these spheres is traceable to this fact. To-day's problems are rather different: we are back with the traditional "humanist-rigorist" question, to the "problem of discipline", especially in things like the pastoral administration of Holy Baptism, Matrimony and Confirmation—which may be one reason why *The Vision of God* remains so topical. Evangelism and sociology are neither unimportant nor forgotten, but the essential distinction is that, with however little success, these *can* be discussed with but the most fleeting reference to doctrine, or with none at all, while the present problems are plainly theological ones. "Applied theology" is becoming a necessity rather than an ideal.

There may also be a further reaction against an exaggerated emphasis on "corporate" organization. The faithful laity are advancing towards creative personal religion and away from conventional churchmanship and subjective pietism. As the "devotional" booklet is replaced by plain ascetical instruction, so the need for ascetical study by both scholar and parish priest is bound to grow. Throughout the pastoral sphere, with its Parish Communion, the "house

church", a developing laity and the problems of discipline, there is a new sense of the corporate-personal relation; of "diversities of gifts within the unity of the Body", and this, I think, is again traceable to *Christ, the Christian and the Church*. The last two chapters are especially pertinent here. We are gradually returning to the view, now plainly expressed by many scholars on many subjects, that the worshipping community itself is the only source of fruitful Christian activity, be it learning, prayer or practical works. All that is very close to ascetical theology.

IV

It is not too difficult to summarize these trends and project them into the future needs of both theology and the living Church. An ascetical approach should provide a stimulus for both, for it safeguards pastoral practice from a shallow empiricism and scholarship from sterile insularity. We are not speaking about a shallow "practical Christianity" but the purposeful application of all doctrine to the life of the whole Church, and if this ideal is objected to by certain scholars I would only ask them to consider how much Patristic literature is in fact "occasional theology"; how much is contained in pastoral epistles and encyclicals, and how much is headed by the very practical word *contra*? A brief look at St Augustine alone shows that there can be nothing disreputable about such an "occasional", "practical", pastoral approach to serious study.

If ascetics is such an approach to all theology, it seems that the logical conclusion would be to eradicate it as a "subject" altogether. That could be the case, but the time is surely not yet. *Christ, the Christian and the Church* is possibly the most truly ascetical study in recent years: it is impossible to read this book seriously and simply "know" its doctrine, it inevitably influences one's life and prayer. Yet my own book, to which I have referred, is virtually a further pastoral-ascetical interpretation of Mascall. Whatever my own attempt is worth, I think this kind of interpretation of current theology will continue to be necessary: a systematic pastoral theology is still badly needed.

Ascetical principles, moreover, form an integrating agent which colour all theological study, especially on the more humble level of ordination training. An ascetical approach could enliven the studies of the ordinary student, which might otherwise be regarded as pre-examination drudgery; a list of isolated subjects might then be seen more as an integrated pattern called, simply, theology. In spite of the work of Dr Kirk and the Bishop of Exeter, dangerous departmentalism still exists in, for example, the isolation of ascetical and moral doctrine. Mischievous thinking about "divorce", homosexuality, gambling and so on, is illustrative of this point, and error is sure to ensue when such broad ascetical problems are discussed in purely moral terms.

Finally, the religious growth of the faithful laity places a proper emphasis upon ascetical-theology as a traditional subject. The ab-

sence of an authoritative body of doctrine, relevant to the personal progress of individual souls within the Mystical Body, points to perhaps the greatest pastoral need of all. Rightly or wrongly (I think wrongly) modern spiritual direction is largely in the hands of a few specialist priests of unusual gifts. This itself implies the lack of any common ascetical system, and our specialists, however valuable their personal ministrations, seem strangely reluctant to write for the instruction of others. But such work must involve considerable research into traditional ascetic, followed by adaptation, still in accord with traditional principles, to the contemporary situation. The days of "simple social ethics" and quasi-Pelagian rules are happily numbered. Deep rooted ascetical doctrine remains the constant need: we end very much as we began, with the need of a new, comprehensive ascetical work, in current style and idiom, to replace those of 1932. To descend to a necessary tautology we need an ascetical ascetical-theology.

MARTIN THORNTON.

Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah

PART I (for General Readers)

THERE is something about Jeremiah which both attracts writers and usually stimulates them to write well. There is, therefore, a large number of books about this most interesting prophet, of which only a selection can be mentioned here.

The best general book is undoubtedly John Skinner's *Prophecy and Religion* (Cambridge University Press, 1922). It must be admitted that the study of Jeremiah has advanced since Skinner wrote, and also that his point of view emphasizes in too one-sided a way the importance of the individual in religion. Nevertheless, this book remains unrivalled as a sympathetic and scholarly interpretation of the prophet's life and teaching. A. C. Welch's *Jeremiah: his Time and his Work* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1928 and 1951) is stimulating and more independent in its thinking, but it makes harder reading and is not infrequently unconvincing.

The same generation of scholars produced other works which deserve mention. H. Wheeler Robinson's *The Cross of Jeremiah* (S.C.M. Press, London, 1925), later reprinted in *The Cross in the Old Testament* (ditto, 1955), is excellent, like everything which the author wrote on Old Testament subjects. G. A. Smith's *Jeremiah* (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1923, revised edn. 1929) is also good.

J. R. Gillies' *Jeremiah: the Man and his Message* (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1907), and W. F. Lofthouse's *Jeremiah and the New Covenant* (S.C.M. Press, London, 1925) are both useful. In contrast, *Jeremiah the Prophet* (Macmillan, New York, 1930), by R. Calkins, is disappointing, because it contains inaccuracies and gives

the impression of being too dependent on other books. T. C. Gordon's *The Rebel Prophet* (J. Clarke and Co., London, n.d. but about 1931) gives the author's reflections on certain aspects of Jeremiah's personality and teaching, rather than a comprehensive account of the prophet. A much older book by T. K. Cheyne, *Jeremiah: his Life and Times* (Nisbet, London, 1888), is readable and free from most of the queer ideas for which the author later became famous, but it is now very dated and somehow fails to get inside the prophet's mind.

All of the books mentioned above are more or less out of date. Two works by American scholars, however, are in touch with more recent studies. *Jeremiah Chronologically Arranged, Translated, and Interpreted* (Abingdon Press, New York and Nashville, 1954), by E. A. Leslie, is useful, though it is written in an infuriating style. J. P. Hyatt's *Jeremiah: Prophet of Courage and Hope* (ditto, 1958) is much better written and is based on more profound scholarship, but it is not so full, and it advances some questionable theories (see the next section).

Although these books are suitable for general readers, there may be some who want something more simple. If so, they will probably enjoy reading *God's Iron* (Skeffington, 1939 and 1956), by G. A. Birmingham (the pen-name of J. O. Hannay). It is written in a popular way, and makes full use of the author's imagination, but it is generally reliable and is based on the study of more scholarly works.

Unfortunately, commentaries in English on Jeremiah are fewer in number than other books about the prophet. Among the older works, the commentary by A. S. Peake in the *Century Bible* series (T. C. and E. C. Jack, Edinburgh and London, n.d. but about 1910–12) is the best and is remarkably full for its size. The second edition (1913) of A. W. Streane's commentary in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges* (Cambridge University Press) is useful, but not nearly as good as Peake's; the first edition (1887) is quite out of date. L. Elliott-Binns has written quite well on Jeremiah for the *Westminster Commentaries* (Methuen, London, 1919), though he tends to be rather long-winded. *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah* (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1906), by S. R. Driver, the great Oxford scholar, offers a translation from the Hebrew with introduction and notes, rather than a full commentary.

In the one-volume commentaries, the best treatment of Jeremiah is that by H. Wheeler Robinson in A. S. Peake's *A Commentary on the Bible* (T. C. and E. C. Jack, Edinburgh and London, 1919). B. M. Pickering's treatment in Charles Gore's *New Commentary* (S.P.C.K., London, 1928) is good as far as it goes, but is too brief. In the *Abingdon Bible Commentary* (Epworth Press, London, 1929), A. C. Welch's discussion of Jeremiah resembles that in his book, noted above.

The most modern commentary is by J. P. Hyatt in the *Interpreter's Bible*, volume 5 (Abingdon Press, New York and Nashville, 1956), and it can be recommended, although, like his book, it advances

some questionable theories. It is a pity that the plan of the series could not have permitted Hyatt's introduction and exegesis to be longer, and dispensed with the homiletic exposition by another writer.

PART II (for Advanced Students and Scholars)

It is yet harder to make a selection of more technical studies of Jeremiah and of works in foreign languages. I have ignored books dealing only with textual or philological matters, and all but a very few articles. Fuller bibliographies can be found in the commentaries, and also in the articles by G. Fohrer in *Theologische Rundschau*, N.F. xix (1951), pp. 305–308, xx (1952), pp. 242–249, E. Vogt in *Biblica* xxxv (1954), pp. 357–365, and H. Wildberger in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 3rd edn, 1959), volume 3, columns 581–590.

The most influential modern commentary is that of Bernhard Duhm (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen and Leipzig, 1901). It is a radical work, which denies a considerable portion of the book of Jeremiah to the prophet, but it frequently shows a sympathetic insight into his mind and is usually stimulating—if only to disagreement. Its publication began a new period in the history of the study of Jeremiah, and it cannot be ignored by anyone engaged in scholarly work on the subject.

The influence of Duhm is clearly to be seen in the excellent commentary by C. H. Cornill (C. H. Lauchnitz, Leipzig, 1905), though Cornill is more conservative. For example, his defence of the authenticity of the prophecy of the new covenant has become the standard refutation of Duhm's views on this subject. Similarly, the second edition of F. Giesebrecht's commentary (Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1907), though it is far from accepting Duhm's radical theories, attributes to later writers much that was ascribed to Jeremiah himself in the first edition (1894). Two other good books by German scholars are W. Erbt's *Jeremia und seine Zeit* (Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1902), and the commentary by P. Volz (A. Deicher, Leipzig, 1922).

Less work on Jeremiah has been published in French, but the commentary by A. Condamin (Paris, 1920) deserves to be mentioned. He frequently finds occasion to quarrel with Duhm, but is far from being rigidly ultra-conservative, particularly in textual matters. He pays special attention to theories of the arrangement of prophetic oracles in strophes.

One of the questions raised by Duhm concerns the relation of Jeremiah to Deuteronomy. This is discussed by most books on Jeremiah, and is carefully examined by J. N. Schofield in *Studies in History and Religion* (Lutterworth Press, London, 1942), edited by E. A. Payne. His conclusion, that Jeremiah did not know Deuteronomy, is discussed and attacked by H. H. Rowley in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1950).

This question is treated in a very different way by S. Mowinckel

in his *Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia* (J. Dybwad, Kristiania, 1914)—another highly important book in the history of the study of Jeremiah. Mowinckel argues that one of the sources of the present book of Jeremiah is a document containing teaching of the prophet which has been moulded and supplemented in a Deuteronomic atmosphere. In his more recent book, *Prophecy and Tradition* (J. Dybwad, Oslo, 1946), he has modified his views, so as to be more conservative and also to attach greater importance to the oral transmission of the material among the prophet's disciples.

A special study of Jeremiah has been made in America by J. P. Hyatt, whose views have been worked out in a number of articles, as well as being presented as a whole in the book and commentary noted in Part I. He has advanced several opinions which are not shared by most scholars. He believes that the Deuteronomic element in Jeremiah is due to a Deuteronomic editor of the book, rather than merely to one source. He also rejects—in agreement with F. Wilke in *Alttestamentlichen Studien Rudolf Kittel zum* 60. *Geburtstag dargebracht* (J. Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1913)—Duhm's theory that the foes from the north referred to by Jeremiah are to be identified with the Scythians (cp. W. Baumgartner in *Archiv Orientalni*, xviii, 1950). Instead, he identifies them with the Chaldeans, and this is one of the reasons why he dates the beginning of the prophet's ministry nearly twenty years later than the year stated in the Old Testament (cp. F. Horst in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xli, 1923).

A. Weiser's commentary (Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1952), a less technical work than most of those mentioned in this section, is especially valuable because of its theological interest. Weiser interprets the prophet's teaching against the background of the covenant festival which, he believes, was celebrated in ancient Israel. This leads him to reject the theory of a Deuteronomic source, and to argue that both Jeremiah and Deuteronomy were influenced by a hortatory style used in this festival (cp. the not dissimilar view advanced by T. H. Robinson in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xlii, 1924).

The most up-to-date and comprehensive book on Jeremiah is the second edition of the commentary by W. Rudolph (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1958). He adopts the view (cp. Volz) that the prophet may not have been much concerned with the precise identity of the foe from the north early in his ministry, and that it is unnecessary to argue that they were the Scythians or the Chaldeans or any other particular race. Rudolph also maintains a modified form of Mowinckel's theory of a Deuteronomic source.

Finally, mention should be made of two studies of the literary forms used in the book of Jeremiah. W. Baumgartner's *Die Klagedichte des Jeremia* (A. Töpelmann, Giessen, 1917) demonstrates that Jeremiah was influenced by psalms of lamentation, and refutes the widely-held view that he was the father of prayer and psalmody. H. Wildberger's *Jahwewort und prophetische Rede bei Jeremia* (Zwingli Verlag, Zürich, 1942) examines the form in which Jeremiah's

oracles are delivered, with the more theological purpose of seeking to understand better the part played by the prophet in the formulation and delivery of the message which he believed that God was giving him.

J. A. Emerton.

John Bramhall's Works on Schism

Charles II was proclaimed King at Westminster on 8 May 1660 and at Dublin on the 14th. In August 1660 he nominated John Bramhall, Bishop of Derry, as Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland. It was an honour well deserved and given to one who had loyally, under hardship, stood by the King. Hence it is fitting that some attention should be devoted to him because of his work for the Anglican Church both as a bishop, primate, and also because of his place in her standpoint and ethos.

Much of Bramhall's best work was done when the new King's fortunes were at their nadir. This can be seen from a study of his works. His greatest literary service to the Anglican Church and to theological thought is found in his writings on schism, and this centenary of the restoration and of the events leading up to the prayer book of 1662 provides a convenient opportunity to focus more attention upon Bramhall's works on the Church of England and the question of schism. We think especially on the best of these writings, *A Last Vindication of the Church of England from the unjust aspersion of Criminal Schism.*

The book has a personal interest for the writer of this article since almost the only valuable book he possesses is a big volume, dated at Dublin 1676, containing the first collected edition of Bramhall's Works. It was the reading of this, amongst other old works, which helped him to realize the truth of the dictum by Dr C. S. Lewis that we should read one old book for every new one, or at least "one old to every three new ones."[1]

Bramhall's book is one of the few old books on this subject of schism which is really accessible to an ordinary reader, for it was republished in the "Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology" and reference in this article will be to that edition. There are other Anglican books before the twentieth century dealing with the topic, but a greater number dealing with the subject are seventeenth century works.

There are several causes for this. One is that the authors were nearer the cleavage of the Reformation; secondly, the hardening of the divisions within and without the Anglican Church occurred from the middle of the seventeenth century onwards. At this time many felt that breaches could be healed; for example, Stillingfleet wrote his *Irenicum* then. Others, like Baxter, felt that they were being

[1] Foreword to *The Incarnation of the Word of God* of St Athanasius.

forced out of the Church of England and compelled to separate. Hence there was quite a spate of books on this topic.

Bramhall's book was slightly earlier and was called into being by different causes, which can be studied in detail in R. S. Bosher's *The Making of the Restoration Settlement*. Briefly, the facts were these. The Roman Catholics had high hopes that some at least of the exiled Anglicans feeling that their futures were at the nadir, that their Church was discredited and outlawed would, under the leadership of Charles' widow Henrietta Maria, return to the Roman allegiance. Bramhall was writing to combat this tendency; his work had to be done in conditions where often he was far from affluent and found it difficult, if not impossible, to refer to books which he must have wanted.[1]

Bramhall's controversy is one of the landmarks in the double battle which Anglicans had to wage from the Reformation onwards. The first great post-Reformation work was a defence, an apology by Jewel in face of Roman controversy. The next great landmark was Hooker's work, chiefly directed to rebut attacks on Puritans. Soon after we have Field in his *De Ecclesia* examining the whole nature and conception of the Church. Laud's only big written work was his controversy with Fisher on Roman claims, and then we have Bramhall's works.

His *Vindication* might be described as a main course or staple dish. The *hors d'œuvres* have been provided by his book against M. de La Milletiere who had invited His Majesty Charles II to join the Roman Catholic Church. This dish had many components outside the range of our main subject. The *Vindication* itself is worthy of Jeremy Taylor's eulogy delivered as part of the funeral oration of Bramhall. In this book we find, says Taylor, "the great lines of Hooker's judiciousness, of Jewel's learning, of the acuteness of Bishop Andrewes". Two replies to Bramhall were made, one with an appendix entitled *Down Derry* (of which Irish see Bramhall was bishop). Bramhall replied to these in his *Reply* and *Schism Guarded* and his refutation of the "Nag's Head Fable". This latter was written in 1658, so it will be seen that the future Primate of All Ireland spent five years on this theological controversy and in learning was no unworthy successor to James Ussher (the previous Primate), the "giant among giants".

Two of the permanent contributions of the *Vindication* are his definition of schism and the reply to the query who are schismatics. The former he treats in an abstract, the latter in a concrete manner.[2] Schism signified a criminous scissure, rent or division in the Church.[3] Here the operative word is really criminous, for Bramhall has remarked earlier "it is not the separation, but the cause that makes the schism".[4] The result of this attitude is that it becomes possible to infer that sometimes the people who are outside a Church are not the schismatics at all. It is those who have forced them outside, and

[1] See Life in Vol. I, p. xi, notes. [2] Vol. I, p. 96. [3] P. 103.
[4] P. 100.

Bramhall shows that this has happened in the case of the Anglican Church, and he states six propositions in defence of his contention.[1]

He proceeds to speak of internal and external communion. The latter, which consists in holding the ancient creeds, using the same sacraments, joining in the same external worship and rites, giving commendatory letters from one Church or person to another and admitting the same discipline and authority, may be suspended.[2] Later he deals with the causes of mere schism. On this point he shows in the *Replication* that while the Catholic Church could not give any just cause of separation from it, yet a particular Church, by heresy, schism, abuse of authority or the obtrusion of errors may do so.[3] This is a truth which needs to be remembered. Historical investigation would reveal that many parts of the Church have broken off from others for one of the four causes just mentioned.

A few pages previously, in order to clarify the context of the word "Church", Bramhall has spoken of three characteristics which distinguish the Church essentially from all other societies. These are a "right profession of saving truth, a right use of the Word and Sacraments and a union under lawful pastors", all taken together.[4] "Lawful pastors" is a phrase which may mean different things, for there are those who have a non-episcopal ministry yet are convinced that their pastors were called of God, were chosen by the whole Church, whether a local body or a larger group, and so in this sense their pastors were lawful. This section is followed by Bramhall's well-known distinction between the nature and perfection of a Church, though many do not know that he borrowed it from a Roman controversialist of a half-century earlier. He also points out that a Church may be said to be "a true Church two ways, metaphysically and morally".[5]

But let us get back to earlier points which merit fuller attention. These are Bramhall's definitions of those who are schismatics and those who are Catholics. The latter are those who are obedient to the faith, have internal communion with other Christians and external as far as possible, who reform only when necessary and what is needful and that with moderation, who derive their Christianity by an uninterrupted line of apostolic succession, and accept the scriptures and due ecclesiastical authority. Then he states who are schismatics: those who uncharitably create rupture, setting up Altar against Altar; those who limit the Catholic Church, refuse proper fellowship to and with others, needlessly reform and break the line of apostolic succession, "which is the very nerves and sinews of ecclesiastical union and communion".[6]

In this statement it is interesting to note that Bramhall, who was a high churchman, seems to repeat what the majority of the Elizabethan divines stressed, namely, the value of the episcopate in securing unity rather than its vital necessity to secure validity of sacra-

[1] P. 97. [2] P. 104. [3] II, 32.
[4] II, 25, and cf. Field, *De Ecclesia*, II, 65 (1847 edition).
[5] P. 25 and II, 38. [6] Pp. 111 f.

ments. This thought may be linked to Bramhall's contention that there may be just causes of separation, and so he refuses to censure Reformed non-episcopal Churches as schismatical, though he laments their lack of episcopacy.[1]

These brief references give little idea of the scope and range of the *Vindication* and Bramhall's other works on the same topic, but they may at least indicate how thorough and how charitable was his treatment. "Everyone", he says, "who is involved materially in a schism is not a formal schismatic", nor are we chargeable with the excesses or extremes of our predecessors.[2] These ideas show how far Bramhall anticipated the current trend to regard schism as trouble within the Church.[3] For those concerned about the nature, extent, causes and cure of schism, the reading of Bramhall's works would prove valuable. His writings reveal four of the essentials which should characterize theological thought. There is clarity in the use of words and in expression; charity towards a different outlook; constant remembrance of the historical situation and the factors which it creates; and a desire to be comprehensive rather than exclusive.

H. F. Woodhouse.

A Gluttonous Man and a Wine-Bibber

Anyone who is considering the problems that are raised by the evangelization of England must at some moment or another do some amateur sociology. He must sit down and consider the various groups into which the population of England falls, classifying them not necessarily according to their age or income group, though this may have a decided bearing on the matter, but according to what we might call their resistance to religion. The person who does this will, I think, find that there are two groups which can be classed as "extremely difficult". One of these groups is of course the industrial proletariat which, as the Bishop of Middleton has so ably demonstrated in his book on Sheffield, *Church and People in an Industrial City,* has never been touched by the Gospel since it first came into existence in the beginning of the last century.

The other group is less easy to define but equally easy to recognize. It consists of those members of the upper and middle classes who have ceased to think on any topic except that of their immediate profession since they reached the age of twenty-three or twenty-five. You will find these people in many places: in army messes, in masonic lodges, in the City of London, in large numbers in the dormitory suburbs around London and possibly around many of the other big towns. They are almost all Conservatives, except possibly in some of the northern towns where Socialism has been established

[1] II, 69–70. [2] II, 390 f.
[3] E.g. A. E. J. Rawlinson, *Problems of Reunion,* p. vii.

for so long that even when working people have achieved the middle-class ethos they have not changed their politics. That they "do not understand modern poetry" is the reason they give for the fact that they have never read any. They say that they think Picasso and other modern artists are just playing a gigantic joke on the public and that they are the only clever ones who are not taken in. They are on the whole in favour of hanging and of flogging, and they consider that all their political opponents are villains of the deepest dye. They go to church occasionally but they never say their prayers. They don't read the Bible, they don't read religious books—for that matter they hardly read any books. Between the ages of sixteen and twenty-three they were quite intelligent, reasonable human beings open to argument, interested in new movements, and if their fathers were, as was almost invariably the case, the kind of people that they are now, their fathers distrusted them as dangerous revolutionaries who would, no doubt, get over it as they became older. They did become older—they got sucked into the whirlpool of business and conformism and they became, as their fathers hoped they would, people like themselves. They regard it as bad form to talk about religion: they regard the parson with a certain kind of half-pitying attitude, which means that even if he does happen to be an interesting person, they do not welcome it if he comes to call—they realize that that is what he is paid for, but they will not ever reveal a chink in their carapace which might provide an opportunity for some religious point that might be embarrassing. They can occasionally be jolted out of this attitude by one of the few outstanding priests whom they regard not only as obviously good but also as successful and competent men. If one of these men has charge of their parish and particularly if he is a good preacher, he may awaken these people from their lethargy. He may get them interested enough that they will begin to see there is something in what he is trying to put over. But this type of man is extremely rare.

Something else is needed; something which can be done by unexceptional Christians. We have got to find the chink in the armour of these people through which they can be attacked—a chink which we can enlarge so that the grace of God will have a chance to enter. Now, there is only one moment when these people talk about religion, and that is after dinner—after the first or second glass of port or whatever it may be. This is a fact. Any priest who has served in an officers' mess, or been a member of a masonic lodge, will agree that this is so, notwithstanding the fact that religion was barred as a topic in both those places. Cannot some use be made of this characteristic? Charles Williams wrote in "The Church Looks Forward", an essay in *St Martin's Review*, July 1940: "It was once suggested—and the suggestion was made neither profanely nor scandalously—that among all the Orders of the Christian Church there lacked one to our Sacred Lord as a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber." What he was saying was that it was a pity that the extremes in religion had always been on the side of the Rejection of Images and not on the side of the Affirmation of Images. But perhaps there is even more in this state-

ment if we take it in conjunction with the conclusions to which we have just come.

How can we use this moment of (in vino) veritas? First, Christians, both priests and laymen, must be ready to deal with these moments when they arise. They must never be more ready to give a reason for the faith that is in them than on such occasions. A country parson dining with the squire, an army padre on mess nights, a chaplain of a masonic lodge on banqueting nights must be on duty all the time. And the layman, too, must be prepared to talk and argue even if he does not really know the answers. He must not say, "Well, this is rather difficult—let us talk it over in the morning", because it is almost certain that he will never get round to talking about it in the morning. Secondly, and looking further into the future, there must be a realization on the part of the Church that there is a great value in this. Certain parishes should take as great care in seeing that their prospective parson knows a claret from a burgundy as country parishes should do in finding out whether their parson knows barley from oats, or is at least prepared to learn. These ideas need a certain amount of money, and those parishes would have to have money; on the other hand, those are the parishes from which money is going to come. So even on a purely business footing this would be a good investment.

What are the objections that may be put forward? There are two —one bad, one good. The bad objection is that our Lord was dedicated to poverty and therefore somehow it is indecent for a Christian, certainly for a clergyman, to enjoy the good things of this life, and it is practically wicked for anyone to enjoy anything while there are so many people who are miserable and starving in the world. Let us go back to that remark of Charles Williams and link it up with one of Miss Dorothy Sayers when she says that the only imputation which was ever brought against our Lord's private life was that he was a glutton and a drunkard and consorted with profiteers, Quislings and prostitutes. From what we know of our Lord, from what we have through the grace of God been able to learn of his character, we can of course dismiss as wild the accusations that he was a glutton and a drunkard. But that they were ever able to be brought does mean, I think, that our Lord was able to appreciate the good things of this world which had been created before Time through him. I owe to some source which I cannot now trace the remark that when he met Zacchaeus he did not preach a sermon to him. He invited himself to lunch. There were doubtless nearly as many poor, miserable people in the world in Christ's lifetime as there are in ours, but that did not mean that he felt that he should eschew all the good things of creation.

The second objection to this scheme—the good one—is that it is extremely dangerous to those, particularly priests, who have to put it into practice. This is true. It is questionable whether it is any more dangerous than the system which sends out clergy into parishes by themselves without any intellectual or spiritual companionship, there to become steadily more incompetent and less spiritual as the years

go by. But there *is* a great danger, although this danger can be largely obviated by employing priests of great interior discipline, or possibly by having, as Charles Williams suggested, a religious order from which priests would be selected for these jobs, their discipline being carefully supervised by their spiritual directors. It should not be impossible to keep these dangers in check; but perhaps we might go further than this if we look at the priest-workmen of France who got lost in a different environment, or at one or two people whom we have known recently who have got lost to the extent that they have committed suicide. Perhaps we can reaffirm that "others he saved, himself he could not save" is one of the fundamental principles of Christianity, and that if by this method some light is let into a few souls a man may consider himself well lost. It is only because we still think in terms of the world that we tend to say, "Ah, but what a lovely temptation of the devil this will make". Any Christian worth his salt will be able, with the help of God and a spiritual director, to know whether what he is doing is really worth while and how much the dangers that he himself runs look like corrupting him to the point where there is no more than he can give.

Those who follow the Way of the Rejection of Images will rightly reject these proposals *for themselves*. But those who follow the Way of the Affirmation of Images on balance—none of us follows either way completely—should have the courage of their convictions, uninfluenced by a muddled Puritanism, and see if there is not some way in which these ideas could be put into practice.

TIMOTHY BEAUMONT.

Music in Worship and Mission Services

A NATIONAL newspaper's report that a London church had replaced the choir and organ at Evensong with a juke-box may well have raised a few eyebrows. The report was somewhat inaccurate: a juke-box certainly was used at a mission service held some time after Evensong, but in addition to a unison choir, and organ, and piano, and instrumental group. Even so, many may question the validity of such practices and doubt the wisdom of using popular music in church. Since several people are now following the example of Father Geoffrey Beaumont and writing and using light music of various kinds in church, and some of us have formed ourselves into a group to promote this music, it would seem opportune to examine some of the theological principles on which its use is based.

While it is true that the worship of the Christian community can be and often is a great converting influence, it is important to remember that the Prayer Book services are not primarily evangelistic or instructional. It is neither possible nor desirable to simplify, add to or mangle the offices or the parish communion to make them so evangelistic as to attract new people. It is, for example, of doubtful wisdom to attempt to "brighten up" Evensong in such a way as to turn it into a cross between the divine office and a mission service.

Our concern is rather that they should be meaningful acts of worship of the Christian community—including its younger and more recent members.

The common prayer of the common people of God takes place in the common tongue, and it would seem natural that the musical idiom of what is sung in worship should as far as possible be common to everyone. This is not easy in a society where several cultures exist side by side, and musical tastes vary so widely. Obviously, consideration must be given to minorities who find a particular musical idiom helpful; and there is an immense variety of church music of the past on which to draw, to enrich the worship of the congregation. Should the Church content herself with using the vehicles of praise of the past? Serious composers are writing a considerable amount of church music; but the very phrase church music is suspect. Should there be a special brand or genre of church music? A Mozart mass is in the same style as the rest of his music, "Abide with me" is in the same style as "Nellie Dean". Church music is simply music used for God. In seeking musical expression common to everyone it follows that the *normal* idiom will be neither Bach nor the latest jazz, but the kind of music that is the background to all our lives—light music of various kinds. The music of "Family Favourites", "Housewives' Choice", of the musicals and the films—at least some of it is enjoyed by all sorts of people, high-brows and low-brows, if it is easy to pick up and easy to sing. The kind of light music members of the "Twentieth-Century Church Light Music Group" are trying to write we believe to have a legitimate place in our common worship, simply because to many people it is a natural way of expressing their joy and thanksgiving, their praise and their love. Other music may do so much more deeply, but running a musical appreciation class is *not* a top priority of the Church—the worship of God is.

The frequent criticism of unworthiness and lack of dignity can be a specious argument. It is dangerous to imagine that provided the music be beautifully rendered Orlando Gibbons or truly great and lasting music of any kind, the offering of worship is then worthy. It is still unworthy. Of course, there is a place for the offering of the great musician and great artist, particularly in the cathedrals and collegiate or quasi-collegiate churches, and at the more objective worship of the divine office. But the claim for a legitimate place for light music rests on theological ground. We are not commanded in our ordinary worship to offer gold, frankincense and myrrh, but ordinary bread and wine and all that they symbolize. Is it honest or logical to tell confirmation candidates that they are to offer to God their whole lives, and then say that the music which permeates the lives of so many is not suitable to be offered? Either it is inherently evil or it can be offered; and if it is a natural idiom to so many then it can legitimately be used in common worship. Even its emotional content need not be condemned. The emotions must be offered if they are to be sanctified, but many of the sung parts of the service are intended to have a subjective quality, to be felt outbursts of praise, etc. It may be that this kind of light music is more appro-

priate for expressing praise and adoration, and has not yet succeeded in expressing penitence very deeply; but then the spoken parts of a service are usually more important, and few of us want to sing about our sins. The new hymn tunes[1] published recently and settings of the communion service being prepared for publication later in the year by the Group are considered purely as an aid to worship for twentieth-century congregations. If they wear out in being used—no matter.

Even those who are sceptical of the value of this music as an element in normal worship are often prepared to concede its usefulness at mission services, in camps and summer schools and all sorts of evangelistic occasions. At such extra-liturgical services the use of visual aids has long been accepted. Why not aural aids? In addition to the music for congregations of any kind to sing, the Group has produced some numbers that are sermons-in-song, using the form of the latest popular songs. Some have been recorded,[2] and eight are now published.[3] The strict discipline of a 32-bar lyric can be a very effective teaching method. At a mission service a local singer may perhaps get a point across better than a visiting preacher, and a congregation is quite prepared to listen. These numbers are not only intended as aural aids for the Church's use, but also as an invasion of the world of the "pop" song. Surely if the Church's message is proclaimed in juke-boxes so much the better. Again, unless a juke-box be inherently evil it can be no more wrong to use it as a medium than to broadcast the Gospel on television. The facility with which people seem to pick up the words of a new record would seem to suggest at least some value in such an attempt at communication.

In using this music at mission services the danger of making up a service wholly divorced from the Church's pattern of worship has been a real one. When a church is filled with people on the fringe of the Christian community, young people, married couples, and others, the object is not only to preach the Gospel, but also to instruct them in the faith, help them to pray, and build them into the worshipping community of the Church. Surely this is what the Missa Catechumenorum set out to do. The ante-Communion service of the Prayer Book provides an admirable *framework* for a mission service. It has the obvious advantage that it prepares people for the parish communion,[4] and may perhaps help to bridge the gulf that is often bewailed between the evening congregation and the morning one. As individuals are prepared for confirmation they will at least know something of the liturgy. It helps to get across the idea that the normal services of the Church are really quite sensible, and disposes of the objection so often voiced after a mission or a special service—"If only the services were always like this." If light music is given a look-in in ordinary worship, they will be. Not least among its merits

[1] *Thirty Twentieth-Century Hymns*. Josef Weinberger, 1960, 6s.
[2] Oriole, CB 1529 and 1530.
[3] *Rhythm in Religion*. Josef Weinberger. 6s. 6d.
[4] Cp. THEOLOGY, May 1958, pp. 193–7.

is the advantage of not having to make up your own framework and knowing that the service has a certain liturgical shape and balance. It would seem to have been the principal diet of many catechumens in the past; an imaginative treatment of the same basic framework may well be a valuable techinque for today.

Whatever the liturgical ideal may be, an immediate practical measure is to model the evening mission service on the shape of the parish communion as it is in a particular church. Provided the shape be adhered to, then it is perfectly legitimate—and necessary—to treat the service as imaginatively as possible, with aural, visual, acted, or any other aids, if desired. Obviously, all parts will not receive equal attention on any one night; but it is not difficult to draw out any great theme of Christian teaching from the liturgy. Since it has been suggested that others might find this way of conducting a mission service helpful, the basic outline of the last "juke-box mission service", after a brief hymn practice, was as follows:

1. Opening hymn of praise. A sound instinct setting the tone for the gathering together for worship. A hymn or song on thanksgiving for everything on the natural level.

2. Lord's Prayer and Collect for Purity (or sincerity, as it might perhaps be better referred to).

3. Penitence. Admission of misuse of God's gifts, an act of penitence, and by way of asking mercy and forgiveness for our own sins and the wrongs of the world, the ninefold "Lord, have mercy" (or response to commandments if it be the practice of the church, or an act of penitence and a suitable hymn).

4. Prayer. A teaching song on prayer was included at this point, then the collect after a few remarks on public prayer.

5. Reading. Epistles, Acts or Old Testament to choose from, with complete freedom to tie up with main theme for the evening, preferably read in a modern translation by a layman.

6. Praise. The response to God's word. A Gradual hymn—or metrical psalm—of praise, or tying up with the epistle.

7. The Gospel. Read by a priest with the congregation standing. Again, chosen freely.

8. Praise. The response to the Gospel, thanksgiving for everything on the supernatural level, working up in time to the Church's hymn of its faith in the Creed. Newman's "Firmly I believe" a useful preliminary; other hymns and/or acts of faith suitable.

9. Sermon or equivalent, whether acted demonstration, sermon-in-song, film-strip, or straight preaching. Much talking not always necessary here since judicious compèring can make the whole service in a sense a sermon.

10. Hymn if wanted, or the teaching of a new hymn.

11. Intercessions, again treated freely to help people to pray, but with some at least of the subjects of the intercessions analogous to the Prayer for the Church Militant, and working towards it.

12. Final hymn (and offerings).

13. Dismissal into the world with the blessing.

14. Voluntary—but not another hymn!

Finally, I must emphasize that the other priests, schoolmasters and organists of the "Twentieth-Century Light Music Group" are in no way responsible for any of the observations I have made in this article, though such insights as it has I have largely gleaned from one or other of them. All of us, however, are convinced that both kinds of music—light music for worship, and evangelistic religious "pops"—can be of service to the Church; and we should welcome both criticism and the suggestions of others engaged in similar efforts.

P. R. N. Appleford.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. C. F. D. Moule is Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

The Rev. Martin Thornton is on the staff of Coppenhall St Michael, Crewe. During the past year he has been lecturing at the General Theological Seminary, New York.

The Rev. J. A. Emerton is a University Lecturer in Theology at Cambridge.

Dr Woodhouse teaches Dogmatic Theology at the University of King's College, Halifax, Canada.

The Rev. T. W. Beaumont has just finished four years in the English-speaking parishes of Hong Kong and is the proprietor and Religious Editor of *Time and Tide*.

The Rev. P. R. N. Appleford is Chaplain of Bishops' College, Cheshunt, and Secretary of the Twentieth-Century Church Light Music Group.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

LITURGICAL REVISION AND A THEOLOGY OF INCORPORATION

Dear Sir,

I read with interest and appreciation the discussion of the revised Canadian rite by Mr Paul Gibson in your issue for June 1960. But I should like to query some of his conclusions.

His main point, if I understand him rightly, is that the Eucharist proper, being worship by the already baptized, should not contain anything which implies the unforgiven-ness or (in that sense) unworthiness of the participants, though of course in all other senses we are all necessarily always unworthy.

Accordingly, he has no use for the idea that the bread and wine may be held to represent the ordinary stuff of our sinful world being brought to God to be consecrated; or for the idea that the postponement of the Prayer of Oblation (as in 1662) until after reception is

a valuable symbol of the worshipper's unworthiness to offer anything except as made worthy by the sacrifice once offered by Christ.

One is bound, of course, to agree that the Eucharist is for those who have been once and for all cleansed. But it is equally true that it is the sacrament of repetition, and stands for, among other things, the reappropriation of what is ours in Christ, the becoming once again what we already are. And if we believe that this can be a reality only in virtue of Christ's prior gift of himself—the divine initiative of God in Christ—then there is much to be said for *dramatizing* this by a sequence which consists of: (*a*) bringing ourselves and the stuff of our lives, all stained and spoilt, back to God once more; (*b*) letting him cleanse and renew us; (*c*) rededicating to him that which is thus cleansed.

Of course we already believe, at stage (*a*), that this has been done in Christ, just as we believe we are forgiven even before we articulate our confession; of course we do not literally have to wait until stage (*c*) before offering ourselves again to God; of course, too, there should be no stress upon the actual moment of consecration, as though this were the moment after which self-offering becomes possible. But the arranging of our worship in this sequence is a way of reminding ourselves that, but for the eternal reality of (*b*), (*a*) would be useless and (*c*) impossible.

That would be my reason for repudiating the implication that, on any showing, "the act of communion makes us more Christian than we were before the liturgy began". One might as well suggest that by Easter Day we are more saved than we were on Maundy Thursday. Liturgy is bound to contain an element of dramatic time-sequence: and the waiting for oblation until after reception in no way implies a denial that the worshipper already is in that new creation in which the baptized belong.

The very secret of liturgy is the becoming what we are: does it help if what we are is so vigorously stressed that there is no room left for becoming?

I am, Sir, yours sincerely,
C. F. D. Moule.

Cambridge.

RELIGION AND MEDICINE

Dear Sir,

After reading the Rev. Michael Wilson's articles on Religion and Medicine we feel that some reply must be attempted both from the medical and from the religious point of view. He seems to confuse where he should separate and to separate where he should fuse.

At times he identifies medicine with religion, as when he writes on p. 234 ". . . in the training of doctors and priests to save/heal persons". That salvation means making men whole is the recovery of a right emphasis; but that this can simply be equated with the healing of physical ills is a gross over-simplification. He implies (p. 185,

para. 2) that sickness is always a manifestation of evil in God's creation. If this is based on the assumptions that pain is always bad, and that God is more concerned with quantity of life than with quality of life, these need careful examination, for there is a good deal in the New Testament which would challenge them.

The ancient Greek trichotomy of man into mind, body, and spirit, which Dr Wilson uses on p. 183, is now in disrepute. Most Christian philosophers and psychologists would prefer to describe man as an organic whole, with emotional, intellectual, and volitional aspects, with God as the ground of our whole being. This view at least harmonizes with the Hebrew concept of man.

Dr Wilson's articles accentuate the gap between the clergy and the medical profession rather than close it, and threaten the integrity of medical science: the arguments he uses make one despair of bridging the gulf. Why does he state that "sickness is deeply rooted in the sin of a fallen world, in our manner of living in society"? Does he presume that sickness did not exist in the animals that inhabited the earth during the millions of years before man appeared? Natural selection requires a high death rate, and surely it is obvious that the death of animals is necessary for the continued existence of life on the earth. Disease is one of the main causes (together with predation and starvation) that keep natural populations in check. Throughout prehistoric times, and until quite recently, most men in common with the animals have died in childhood or in their prime (see D. Lack, *Evolutionary Theory and Christian Belief*, 1957, ch. 7).

Dr Wilson's remarks about duodenal ulcer are sweeping and unscientific. Research into this disease has shown that the cause is complex. Certainly anxiety and stress play their part in aggravating the symptoms of peptic ulcer, but it is doubtful if they are the primary causes. There are important constitutional factors involved. Eighty per cent of cases occur in males. Recently a definite correlation with blood groups has been shown; Group O persons being more liable to the disease than Groups A and D (Aird, Bentall and Roberts, 1953, confirmed by Clarke *et al.*, 1955). There are hereditary factors, and the prevalence of ulcer is greater among the relatives of ulcer subjects than among the general population (Doll and Buch, 1950). Dr Wilson states that he saw only one African with duodenal ulcer in eight years in Ghana, and draws the conclusion that this is due to the "anxiety, tension, and cupidity of Western civilization" (p. 187). To say the least, this is misleading, as he does not appear to have considered the possibility of racial and genetic differences or differences in diet and climate between the Africans and ourselves. He may be interested to know that duodenal ulcer is prevalent in both the western and eastern regions of Southern Nigeria, but that it is rare in Northern Nigeria. Konstam (1954, *Lancet*, 2, 1039) has reviewed twenty consecutive cases of proved peptic ulcer seen during nine months at Ibadan in 1953–4. All the patients were "unemancipated in customs and eating-habits and the large majority were poor". We cannot attribute the cause in Nigeria to the tensions of modern life, as life goes on in the villages much as it did centuries

ago. In India, peptic ulcer is fifteen times commoner in the south than in the north (Dogra, 1950); differences of incidence have also been shown in Malaya. The causes of these differences may well be dietary.

What is Dr Wilson's meaning when he says (p. 186), "the stubborn fact remains that to-day water comes to us from taps, bread ready sliced in hygienic wrappers: and, as a nation, we are getting further from nature"? Does he find more satisfying his "cup of cold water" of the early church complete with germs of foul diseases which scarcely exist to-day? Why the criticism that we are getting further from nature, as if nature were some static ideal condition instead of a constantly changing environment where there is a vast wastage of life? Is it not the uniqueness of man that he can rise above and control his environment? To quote from *The Phenomenon of Man* by Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (p. 280): "When mankind has once realized that its first function is to penetrate, intellectually unify, and harness the energies which surround it, in order still further to understand and master them, there will no longer be any danger of running into an upper limit of its florescence."

Yours faithfully,

(Dr) June Brown.
(The Rev.) Hugh Melinsky.

Wareham.

THE WORLD'S CONVERSION—AN IDLE DREAM?

Dear Sir,

In reply to Mr Jones's question as to the exact meaning of a Christian world, I would refer him, for one example, to John Newton's sermons on Handel's *Messiah,* where the subject is dealt with several times. One sermon, on "The Extent of Messiah's Spiritual Kingdom", points out that such prophecies as Isaiah 2, 11 and 60 have not yet been fulfilled. But the promises of the Lord cannot fail. It is not necessary, he says, to suppose that every individual shall be savingly converted to the Lord in this future day of his power, but (i) the Gospel shall visit nations now in darkness, (ii) this Gospel shall prevail, not in word only, but in power, (iii) disputes among Christians shall cease, and (iv) it will be a time of general peace.

See also John Wesley's sermon on Isaiah 11. 9, "The General Spread of the Gospel". Bunyan's work *The Holy City* describes a world which has become Christian. Whether we agree with the idea or not, it is certainly not meaningless or unintelligible.

Yours faithfully,

T. Francis Glasson.

76 Chestnut Road,
S.E.27.

THE GOSPEL LECTION IN THE RITE OF INFANT BAPTISM

DEAR SIR,

I am afraid Mr Pocknee has not seen my point. The authenticity of Matt. 28. 18–20 is doubtful, not because it is "inconvenient", but because it is very widely thought that its actual words are "too theological to be quite primitive".[1] The passage is doctrinally extremely convenient; but it is one thing for the Church to use it as an apt summary of authentic Christian doctrine and quite another for it to declare solemnly and authoritatively that Christ spoke these very words. It may well mystify and dismay the "ordinary people" who try to study the Bible if they find the Church taking no cognisance of the opinions of responsible and even conservative scholars.

Yours faithfully,

L. H. OPPENHEIMER.

10 NORTHMOOR ROAD,
OXFORD.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST MARK. By C. E. B. Cranfield. Cambridge University Press. 1959. 40s.

This is the second volume to appear in The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. A solid and useful piece of work, it owes much to Dr Vincent Taylor's magisterial commentary, but students and others will find this a more convenient book to handle and use. Many more readers could benefit from such an exposition of the Greek text of Mark than in fact are likely to do so. The commentary is preceded by a brief Introduction of under thirty pages, in which the usual questions are discussed and a decidedly conservative position adopted. The special purposes of Mark's gospel are to "supply the catechetical and liturgical needs of the church in Rome, to support its faith in face of the threat of martyrdom and to provide material for missionary preachers". Mr J. N. Sanders provides a valuable chapter in the Introduction on Textual Criticism.

The commentary's conservative bias comes out in detail in the Notes on the text. The historical reliability of Mark is repeatedly stressed, and in particular evidence of eye-witness reporting is found at many points. Here the discerning reader may like to compare Mr Cranfield's approach with the articles of Professor Nineham in *J.T.S.* of 1958. Pointed criticisms are directed at the exaggerated scepticism of the form-critical school, but not all will be able to go so far in the opposite direction, e.g. the salvaging of chapter 13 almost whole. At the same time everyone has learned from the form-critical approach, and we find the gospel material well related to the circum-

[1] Lowther Clarke, *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 417.

stances of the church in Mark's own time; for instance, the element of symbolism in the sea-miracles is well brought out, the persecution-context of a saying like 9. 43 is recognized, the part played by the community or the evangelist in commenting on the traditional material allowed for at 2. 10, 2. 28, 7. 19b, 15. 38; here Cranfield reminds us that this supposedly "modern" view was not unknown to patristic commentators. More might have been made of the persecution-setting of Mark generally; in particular Mark wants to underline the continuation of the messianic sufferings in the life of the community, for surely the evangelist sees the Jewish idea of "messianic birth-pangs" working out like this, and his teaching is fundamentally the same as Paul's identification of the Christian with Christ's Passion and Death. Possibly the same setting leads to a presentation of the eschatology of Jesus, which underscores too heavily the imminence of the Parousia.

The Cambridge series aims to pay special attention to the "elucidation of the theological and religious content of the New Testament". The present volume excellently fulfils this aim. The Introduction contents itself with a convenient list of places in the commentary where the main topics are discussed. Some of these sections, such as those on the Kingdom of God (the mystery of which is the mystery of the Person of Jesus) and the Son of Man, are models of brevity and clarity. The nature of the divine revelation in the words and works, the life and death of Jesus, is frequently brought out and summed up in the suggestive if slightly awkward phrase "messianic veiledness". Throughout the theology of St John is compared with that of the evangelist, who is found to have the Johannine understanding of the miracles though without John's characteristic *σημεῖον*. The comment on *ὑπάγει* in 14. 21 suggests that this word represents Jesus' own way of talking about his departure from this world to the Father, better preserved by St John than by the synoptic tradition. As with St. John, Cranfield brings out the connexions with Pauline theology, especially with reference to Jesus' attitude to the Law in 7. 1–23.

Though the emphasis is properly on theology, textual and linguistic questions are discussed, and so varied and substantial fare is offered to the reader. Often the commentator's beloved Calvin is impressed into illuminating service. There are places where different readers will register disagreement, and one or two criticisms suggest themselves. The commentary is perhaps too cautious and unadventurous, and I do not refer merely to critical and historical positions adopted. The reader will look in vain for any discussion of Marcan patterns. His understanding of Mark's Passion and Resurrection narrative would have been deeper if some reference had been made to Professor Evans's article, "I will go before you into Galilee", in *J.T.S.* of 1954. There is no discussion of the Sabbath as pointing to the messianic age and therefore the day of Jesus' healing work par excellence. Perhaps now more ought to be said about the date of the Last Supper, in view of the suggestion made that it took place on the Tuesday before the Crucifixion. But one cannot have everything,

and much is provided in this pleasingly produced if rather expensive book. The General Editor is sure to be criticized for not printing the Greek text in this series; but in the present instance this could send the reader not only to the Bible Society's recent edition of the Greek Testament (whose text and apparatus are for the most part followed) but also to a synopsis like Huck.

Derek W. Allen.

King's College,
London.

Patrology. By Berthold Altaner. Translated by Hilda Graef. Nelson. 1960. 60s.

"Many times there is more business to find out what should be read than to read it when it is found out." This ancient complaint against the rules called the pie is the modern complaint of many a scholar when faced with the variety of writings in many differing languages and journals upon the subjects with which he is concerned. Students of patristics are no exception. Any work therefore which will reliably assist the scholar in this first part of his task is deserving of a great welcome.

Altaner's *Patrologie* was first published in German in 1938 and will already be familiar to patristic scholars as an invaluable guide. This English translation is based on the revised German edition published in 1958 and includes references to works up to October 1958. It provides an introduction to the life and work of early Christian writers up to the eighth century and includes within its scope not only the well-known Fathers of the Church but very many lesser writers as well. The only comparable work in English is the fuller Patrology of another Roman Catholic writer, Johannes Quasten. But Quasten's work is to be in four volumes, of which only the first two, dealing with the period up to Nicaea, have so far been published. Altaner's work therefore is at present without parallel in English.

So far I have stressed its value as a bibliographical guide for the patristic scholar. That I believe to be its most valuable function. But fundamentally it serves two purposes. For the ordinary reader the appended bibliographies may well seem excessively detailed and rather overpowering, but the brief summaries of each author—his life, his writings and the substance of his teaching—will be a useful and generally reliable source of information. One warning, however, does need to be sounded; although Altaner is extremely honest in his assessment of evidence, his summaries often incline to give not so much a balanced account of the author's teaching as a whole, but rather a very fair account of how far the author reflects later Roman Catholic ideas. For the specialist these introductions will inevitably seem somewhat oversimplified; he will meet assertions stated definitely which he would like to see qualified with some element of doubt; he will meet generalizations that seem to him too sweeping. But perhaps it is more remarkable that in so compressed a work this happens so comparatively rarely. On the other hand, he will find the

bibliographies a quite indispensable tool for his own work. These include not only relevant books, but articles from a wide range of journals. These latter references are made the more useful by the inclusion of a brief indication of the particular topic of each article.

All in all, this is an invaluable work of reference for anyone interested in the writings of the early church; primarily it will supply the scholar with detailed bibliographical guidance, but it will also serve the needs of those in search of more straightforward introductory information.

A number of typographical errors, which one might reasonably have hoped to see corrected in an English version, have been simply carried over from the German, e.g. Lamme (for Lampe), Retcliff (for Ratcliff). It may sound a little pedantic to complain about initials in a complex bibliographical work of this kind, but it does seem a little hard to ascribe the labour of translating the Contra Celsum to O. Chadwick.

M. F. Wiles.

Clare College,
Cambridge.

Les Origines de la Réforme française: Meaux, 1518-46. By R.-J. Lovy. Paris, Librairie Protestante. 5 illustrations. 1959. N.p.

The origins of the Huguenot movement are not well known in this country. Lefèvre of Etaples, though no professional in theology, and though always a conservative over relics and saints, spending long hours on his knees before statues, had given the University of Paris examples of that freshness of biblical study and that shrinking from the mere argumentations of the schools; mingling his philosophy with religious exhortations of a practical character, and all with a moderate and conciliatory spirit. But we should not exaggerate his influence. Erasmus said that he was only half a grammarian and a mediocre scholar of Greek. His contemporary influence was much less marked than later theologians, looking back to their predecessors, were inclined to suppose. Luther had begun by respecting him not uncritically, but by 1523 was suppressing his own borrowings from Lefèvre's writings. As the Reformers drew away and left the Erasmians behind, there was never any doubt where Lefèvre would be found.

Nevertheless, by 1524 the group of Lutheranizers at Meaux was already a force, and some thought Lefèvre to be at the bottom of it all. They were like the little group meeting at the White Horse Inn in Cambridge, some to be enemies of the Reformation, some middle men, some who would end at the stake, some who would perhaps end as leaders of a Reformed church. One of Lefèvre's disciples was Farel, later Calvin's colleague; another was Clichtoveus, one of Luther's bitterest foes.

The group was founded upon another pupil of Lefèvre, Briçonnet, Bishop of Meaux. More a reformer of pastoral practice than of doctrine, not a theologian, something of a mystic in his spirit, he in-

tended to institute a preaching ministry and popular instruction in the vulgar tongue, instruction which should be primarily biblical. An English parallel would be a bishop like Latimer, though Latimer shared little or none of Briçonnet's mysticism—perhaps a Latimer mingled with a John Colet might be taken to represent him. No Reformer himself, in the doctrinal sense, no adherent of Luther, he nevertheless gathered round him men who were attracted to the reading of Lutheran literature and who were hardly safe in Paris—among them Farel; and some of his preachers in the vulgar tongue were of the same sympathy.

The group survived for a time, partly by the patronage of Briçonnet, still more by the patronage of Marguerite of Alençon, the future queen of Navarre, who not only protected them at court, but procured them Luther's works, helped them to print their own, and was herself (as has been proved) well read in Luther's writings. But it survived only a few years; by 1525–6 it was almost repressed out of existence, and thereafter maintained a tenuous existence, while the headship of French Protestantism passed of necessity to Switzerland, and to less Lutheran leaders.

This is a good outline of the story, with interesting and not easily accessible quotations. Its author is a member of the French Reformed community; and though he looks back upon these founders with a piety and a gratitude which cannot always preserve an impartial air, and though there are a few odd sentences, he writes with clarity, affection, and justice. There is a bibliography but no apparatus.

Owen Chadwick.

Selwyn College,
Cambridge.

J. G. Hamann, 1730–88: A Study in Christian Existence. By Ronald Gregor Smith. Collins. 21s.

Here at last is the Glasgow professor of divinity's awaited little book on Hamann, that great shadowy eighteenth-century figure who looms behind Kierkegaard. It is the first to appear in this country. Whereas hitherto the mighty claims advanced on behalf of Hamann had to rest on hearsay, now anybody in England may go to the root of the matter for himself, and the reviewer's duty is to invite as many as possible to do so.

The book is in two parts. The first is biographical, and the second consists of the author's translations of selected writings. The translations seem to be admirably done, but they call for a warning. Hamann as a writer is likely to rebuff, and even to the persistent his ultimate meaning to withhold. According to a footnote on p. 47, a full understanding of his letters defied Hegel as it had previously defied Kant. He did not have it in him to be systematic and clear. His spontaneous form of expression was "the brief, pregnant, allusive and obscure remark". As Professor Gregor Smith says, the writ-

ings have to be taken with the man, and then only do they fall into place.

Is it the man that emerges from the first part? The very comprehensiveness and subtlety of this part may make it rather flat. Contrast Walter Lowrie's arresting use in his booklet of 1950 of Hamann's retort to Hume which Kierkegaard copied into his *Journal*: "*Incredibile sed verum.* Lies and fictitious romances must be plausible, and so too hypotheses and fables; but not the truths and basic statements of our faith." Contrast that, I say, with Professor Gregor Smith's distinction between Hume's understanding of belief and Hamann's understanding of faith. Hume's point of resignation and return is for Hamann the point of departure. Real light is shed on Hamann's ostensible elusiveness:

> When he says that the function of reason is to be the schoolmaster for faith, there is a formal resemblance with the [scholastic compromise between the respective provinces and capacities of reason and faith]. And when he seizes on the superficial concession which Hume makes to belief, he might seem to be merely making the best of a bad job. But the way in which he both respects and yet goes beyond Hume's position (both his intellectual position and the silent compromise of his actual conduct) indicates that Hamann is pointing to a new possibility, which neither the scholastics nor the *illuminati* were able to see. He deepens the conception of faith so that the disjunction between it and reason is in a fair way to being overcome.

I suspect a fallacy in the last sentence, but evidently this book is an introduction to Hamann himself.

Montgomery Belgion.

Peterborough.

Order, Goodness, Glory. By W. A. Whitehouse. O.U.P. for the University of Durham. 1960. 9s. 6d.

Prudence. By Josef Pieper. Faber and Faber. 1960. 12s. 6d.

Erasmus and the Humanist Experiment. By Louis Bouyer. Geoffrey Chapman. 1959. 18s.

The Riddell Memorial Lectures for 1959 (now published under the splendid title *Order, Goodness, Glory*) are not easy to summarize and evaluate. The structure of the argument is often obscure; the tentative, exploratory tone forbids the ascription of a clearly defined position. Furthermore, there are ambiguities in some of the key-words—"world", "natural", for example—ambiguities of which the author is well aware but which he has not succeeded in removing. Nevertheless, despite these difficulties, this is an interesting, sometimes profound, sometimes moving book.

We may not, so the author believes, acquiesce in the present absence of conflict or even of "conversation" between natural science and Christian faith. He has been stimulated by reports of continental discussions, notably at Göttingen, to reopen the "conversation". Plainly there is no point in indulging in risky apologetics for Faith against Science, or in elaborating a Reason-plus-Revelation kind of

systematic theology; nor is it worth while playing the game in which Christians and Agnostics explain to one another how they maintain their positions with intellectual integrity. How is the "conversation" to start? The author takes the Christian doctrine of creation, the first thirty-four verses of Genesis as understood in the light of the Resurrection-faith, and sets it alongside the reports of Natural Science in the hope of achieving "binocular vision". He invites us to look for something in the world revealed by Natural Science answering to the Order, Goodness and Glory traditionally supposed to be there, even if obscurely. The search is arduous enough with little to show at the end. The "arrangement of things" gives only bare hints of a special place for man in a world in whose historical unfolding he has played only a minute part. As for the world's "reliability", in respect of physical actuality it is, for science, only trivial; in all other respects it allows scope for evil and chaos. The world is only reliable for Faith through God's action in Christ; perhaps we might look again at the biblical notion of things being held together in Christ, to replace the outworn concept of "Nature", and try to find some substitute in new ontology for the "Supreme Good". We must learn, too, to look for signs of "distinction" in the world, for "grace" which will evoke a gratitude all of a piece with our gratitude for Christ.

Dr Pieper's book has two main strands. The first is description and analysis of the Thomist doctrine of Prudence as mould and mother of all the other cardinal virtues, the second is protestation against a distortion and neglect of the doctrine in the interests of casuistry and moralism. Thomist ethics is of a "correspondence" type in which prudence is shown as playing a pre-eminent role. The universal principles of morality are "given"; what can and must, for right action, be prudent are the evaluation of the particular case, the construction of means to a decided end and the consequent realization of the end. This sounds trivial and unexceptionable enough, but Dr Pieper shows how it follows that there can be no substitute for prudence, "the quintessence of ethical maturity", in an enlarged casuistry, which cannot, of necessity, take into account all circumstances and tends, indeed, to promote immaturity.

I cannot commend Fr Bouyer's book. The problem he approaches, viz. why the Church apparently failed to capture the Renaissance, is fascinating. A muddling rehash of biographies and ideas no way helps to its solution. The chronology is confused, the historical judgments are ambitious and unsupported, simple Latin texts are mistranslated. There are a number of misprints and crudities of English style.

Lionel R. Wickham.

Boston, Lincs.

Chance and Providence. By William G. Pollard. Faber and Faber. 1959. 16s.

Mr Pollard is concerned to show that a right understanding of the contemporary scientific outlook no longer precludes a firm faith in

divine providence. He writes: "The thesis on which our whole consideration of the nature of providence rests is simply that, contrary to a widespread impression even among scientists, the world is so constituted that the ultimate as well as present characteristic mode of scientific explanation in all fields is statistical" (p. 38). In other words, nature always takes a particular course, but the course taken is always one of several possible courses. The natural scientist, as a scientist, cannot by further scientific experiments discover whether particular events are due to chance, to law, or to providence. The unbeliever thinks that the course of events is due to chance and accident. The believer in the Christian revelation is confident that all events are under the providential control and that certain significant (often called "miraculous") events display with special clarity the working of God. This insight, Mr Pollard affirms, is only attained by those who share the life of the Christian community and accept the Christian revelation. The Christian believer should welcome the new scientific insight into the looser texture of nature because only such an order can be a convenient instrument of the providence of God. The Christian view and the contemporary scientific view of the world are not mutually exclusive but complementary.

In spite of the fresh and lucid way in which the whole book is written, I was left with a number of misgivings and questions. I felt that so much attention was given to the possibility and actuality of divine providence in the natural order that the problems of divine control of human activity were not sufficiently faced. And, in regard to the natural order, supposing that there is a realm of occurrences for ever below the threshold of scientific investigation, how can I know that they are caused? And, if they are caused, how can I know that they are caused by God? And if God can control the natural order in the manner supposed by Mr Pollard, what are we to think of such events as the recent earthquake at Agadir? If the apparent impediments to divine providence are less than had been thought, the problem of evil is increased. But, in raising these questions, it ought to be remembered that no book on the action of God is likely to solve all the problems, and Mr Pollard at least shows clearly that those who believe in divine providence must conceive of the natural order in a way which does not make divine providence inconceivable.

G. F. Woods.

Downing College,
Cambridge.

SHORTER NOTICES

Confession. By the Community of Saint-Severin. Geoffrey Chapman. 1959. 10s.

An unusual little book on Confession, of particular value to the layman and of considerable interest to Anglican priests. Part I deals with the Sacrament itself. Part II with its biblical connexion and historical development. Part III with Examination of Conscience,

with a useful list of "Questions". Part IV contains various Readings.

The authors make it quite clear in a brief introduction what the book is and what it is not. They conclude by saying that "The doctrine of Penance falls short of the stage reached by the doctrine of the Eucharist and the practice of Confession falls short of the stage reached by the practice of the Liturgy". Their meaning becomes clear in the text when they express approval of the practice of the "Asperges" before the Parish Mass, as it is an act of corporate penance, off-setting the individualistic character of sacramental Confession. Some Anglicans accustomed to the sonorous and frequent repetition of the "General Confession" may be inclined to question the value of this practice and to prefer the unliturgical and individualistic practice as it now obtains in the Roman Catholic Church.

B. M. Oman, O.G.S.

Bute Street,
Cardiff Docks.

St John's Gospel, An Exposition. By Walter Lüthi. Oliver and Boyd. 25s.

Introduction to the Bible. By B. M. Metzger, K. J. Foreman, D. G. Miller, A. B. Rhodes, B. H. Kelly; Genesis. By C. T. Fritsch; Hosea to Jonah. By Jacob Myers; Saint Luke. By D. G. Miller; Galatians to Colossians. By A. M. Hunter. Layman's Bible *Commentaries*, S.C.M. Press. 6s. each.

The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians and Philemon, An Introduction and Commentary. By the Rev. H. M. Carson. *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries.* Tyndale Press. 7s. 6d.

Philemon among the Letters of Paul. By John Knox. Collins. 10s. 6d.

Professor Lüthi's book on the Fourth Gospel is not a commentary in any sense, but a collection of sermons built round the various parts of that gospel; they were originally preached in Basle during the years 1939–42. In its German form the book has run to four editions, and now appears in English. The sermons convey echoes of war-time Switzerland, "on the edge of the volcano", fearful for her neutrality yet aware of her involvement in world affairs.

The book finely presents Christ as the one hope of men, and speaks to the condition of those everywhere who find (as eventually we all do) that the last earthly prop has gone and only God is left. "We looked for Christ," says the author in his preface, "and all at once we saw Christ alone; he became our only support in life and death." Yet this does not lead to quietism: the faith must continually be brought to bear on the worlds of business and politics, though in such a way as to avoid "fanaticism". Here is a devout mind grappling with the problems of the day in the light of a typically Protestant Christianity, and bringing courage and hope to many.

But the book is specifically presented as an exposition of the

Fourth Gospel, and this provokes the criticism that its pages reflect little of the work that has been done in this field. Thus the Fourth Gospel is apparently assumed without ado to be the witness of the Apostle John; the *pericope adulterae* is treated as an integral part of chapter eight; the Johannine account is taken on exactly the same level as the synoptics. This is refreshing in contrast to the rigid treatment which sets John exclusively against a Hellenistic background, and is excusable on the ground that the book began as a series of sermons, but something is certainly lost by the failure to emphasize the characteristic Johannine themes and Johannine treatment of eschatology, judgment, and the "innocence" of God. It might be felt that for these sermons eternal life is less a present possession than something which happens after death, and only so has repercussions on life here and now. If so, this is more traditional than biblical. The whip of string at the Cleansing of the Temple is symbolic of the scourge of total war which God flings at the nations, but there is no mention of the Johannine doctrine of judgment by self-exclusion from the light—a much profounder and more sobering conception and an essential part of the theology of the Fourth Gospel. The preacher sees a sign of God's judgment in the striking of a church by lightning; John refuses to see it in a man born blind: "Neither this man nor his parents sinned."

The five books in the *Layman's Commentaries* series form the first part of a library of twenty-five volumes specially designed for the "lay man or woman in the ordinary church—for the person who has a real interest, but is not (or not yet) prepared for anything technical". So writes Professor A. M. Hunter in his preface. They are written from a moderate position and may be said to represent the fruits of Anglo-Saxon scholarship in a form in which they can be assimilated by anyone with the right sort of intelligence and who is ready to apply himself diligently to the task of understanding the Bible. The writers make a valiant effort to reach the level of the readers they have in mind and often succeed brilliantly, but, as might be expected, the attempt to be simple without losing in profundity meets with varying success. The reader who finds himself among the Targums, the Chester Beatty Papyri and the great uncials as well as such words as aetiological and eschatological might well feel that this was more technical than he was prepared for. These books are, however, carefully written and are full of interesting material for the reader who is able to put forth the necessary intellectual effort. There is no doubt that most of us would benefit from reading them and all would find much of interest.

Mr Carson's book on Colossians and Philemon is also one of a series, being the latest of the *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries* under the general editorship of Professor R. V. G. Tasker. These are based on the so-called Authorized Version of the Bible, "partly because this is the version which most Bible readers possess", and the writer of this particular volume declares that it started life as a course of sermons from the pulpit of a parish church, "and has been continued and completed in the same context". A wide public is

therefore in view. Nevertheless, the assumption is made that the reader will be familiar with such terms as "Textus Receptus" and will not be put off by Greek words in transliteration. The printing is very clear and renders it easy to find one's way about. The epistles are commented on verse by verse; and it is probable that this method will make it easier to use the book along with the Bible than that adopted in the *Layman's Commentaries* of covering whole sections blanket-fashion. Mr Carson shows himself acquainted with the problems involved in the two epistles and follows Professor C. F. D. Moule as against several other modern scholars in returning to Rome to find their place of origin. He also rejects the views of Professor John Knox on Philemon, which will occupy us in a moment.

The Epistle to Philemon figures once more in the new edition of a study by Professor John Knox, first produced in 1935. This is an original work, and its clear style and close reasoning make it a pleasure to read. Knox argues (on lines reminiscent of early legend) that Onesimus became an important man in the Church, was the Bishop to whom Ignatius sent his Epistle to the Ephesians, and was responsible for the collection of the Pauline corpus. This explains the inclusion of the letter to Philemon (which, however, was really addressed to Archippus) and explains also why the Epistle to the Ephesians could be produced by an author (not Paul) who could combine a slavish imitation of Colossians with the consummate artistry which the epistle displays. It will be remembered that Professor E. J. Goodspeed had already argued that Ephesians was an introduction to the whole corpus, perhaps written by Onesimus himself, and this provides the stimulus for Knox's discussion. Not everyone has been convinced by the argument, but it is important, and the book is disarming in its clarity and skill of presentation.

E. M. Sidebottom.

The Vicarage,
Hart,
Co. Durham.

A Rocking-horse Catholic. By Caryll Houselander. Sheed and Ward. 1960. 10s. 6d.

Within the Church. By Ancilla. Darton, Longman and Todd. 1960. 15s.

God in my Unbelief. By J. W. Stevenson. Collins. 1960. 12s. 6d.

The Life of Rowland Taylor. By William James Brown. Epworth Press. 1959. 21s.

The first three books in this list are autobiographical. Caryll Houselander, who died in 1954 in her early fifties, was a Roman Catholic. Ancilla, a humanist intellectual who was converted in 1951, is an Anglican. J. W. Stevenson is a Minister of the Church of Scotland. All three authors write from an experience of mental and spiritual conflict. Together they provide an illuminating commentary on the three religious traditions which they represent.

The Roman Catholic (*A Rocking-horse Catholic*) was shy and sensitive as a child, and suffered from neurotic illnesses which interfered with her schooling. For a long period of her adult life, during which she endured abject poverty, she became antagonistic to the Church, but was ultimately reconciled. "Realization of our oneness in Christ," she says (p. 140), "is the only cure for human loneliness," and this she found at last in the Church's teaching that "Christ and his Church are one". But this truth was only gradually revealed to her, through three remarkable "visions" at three distinct moments in the course of her life. It is a strangely moving story, simply and unassumingly told.

The Anglican (*Within the Church*), who regards herself as quite an ordinary person, nevertheless also writes from a background of mystical experience, and it is in this that the interest of the book really consists, because mystics are neither common nor generally encouraged in the Church of England. In the first five chapters the author reveals her own particular problems as a newly-confirmed Anglican. Not until the sixth chapter does she analyse her mystical experiences. In the seventh, and last, chapter she gives some account of the varieties of mystical experience inside and outside Christianity, and concludes that it is a manifestation of the Holy Spirit which it is the Church's responsibility to safeguard and foster. This last chapter is the most useful in the book and would perhaps have come better at the beginning than at the end, thus providing at the start a clear framework for the whole.

The value of the book lies in the assumption that "mysticism" (in the best sense of that word) is a normal phenomenon for ordinary people. As Ancilla rightly says, "Opportunities for and training in contemplation are necessary since Christianity is neither a philosophy, nor the pursuit of theological conceptions, but a communion with a God-who-is, a Real Presence, incomprehensible, unknowable, inaccessible, yet a living God not a figment of man's heart's desire" (p. 147). *Within the Church* might very well serve as an introductory handbook for such training for Anglican lay people, since it deals simply and straightforwardly with the real situations and problems of a Christian mystic "within the Church of England".

The Presbyterian (*God is my Unbelief*) wrestles agonizingly with the pastoral problems of a Highland parish. He discovers ever deeper depths of self-deception in himself and his parishioners, but this revelation is for him, and also for them, a sign of the Church's vitality and the means of spiritual renewal. There are many profound insights, but the author's declamatory style and repetitiveness become at times rather wearisome.

The Life of Rowland Taylor takes us back to the sixteenth century when these three religious traditions were crystallizing out. Taylor was one of the Cambridge Reformers, one of Cranmer's Chaplains, and later Rector of Hadleigh, whose martyrdom under Mary in 1554–5 Foxe describes at some length in his *Acts and Monuments*. The last half of W. J. Brown's book is, in fact, largely a transcript of Foxe. The resultant picture of the man is inevitably lop-

sided, because so little is known of Taylor's earlier history. But the author has gathered together a number of references to Taylor from the writings of Strype, Wriothesley, and John Bradford, and from the State Letters and Papers; and the value of the book lies in this selection of quotations from contemporary documents which brings the sixteenth century vividly before our eyes. The author supplements these quotations with some useful and succinct sketches of the historical background under the first three Tudors.

This is a scholarly and judicious essay which brings into the limelight one of the lesser-known Reformers. But, as the author himself maintains, it is, owing to the scarcity of source material, no more than a "sketch".

J. C. Brooks.

Cuddesdon College,
Oxford.

The Palm Tree of Deborah. By Moses Cordovero. Trans. by Louis Jacobs. Valentine, Mitchell. 1960. 18s.

This treatise of one of the foremost Jewish mystics of fifteenth-century Safed offers an instructive glimpse into the ethical thought of the Kabbalah. It interprets in terms of Jewish mysticism the Rabbinic doctrine of "the imitation of God". Dr Jacobs not only gives a pleasing, clear English rendering but also briefly sets out in a useful introduction the principal features of the Jewish mystics' idea of God. The treatise shows how man's imitation of God's attributes, understood as emanations of the unknowable essence of the absolutely one God, can influence the higher world; and how by his own striving for ethical perfection man can demonstrate the unity of the Divine Essence with the Ten Sephiroth or Emanations of his qualities. Useful annotations facilitate the understanding of an intricate mystical tract which is one of the best introductions to the religious thought and ethical concern of classical Jewish mysticism.

E. I. J. Rosenthal.

Cambridge.

BOOK NOTES

A new cloth-bound edition of Adolf Harnack's *Outlines of the History of Dogma* has been published by Ernest Benn, with an introduction by Philip Rieff (35s.): it has been out of print for a long time. Professor C. H. Dodd's *The Bible To-day* is now available as a paper-back (Cambridge University Press, 8s. 6d.). A sixth edition of Denis E. Taylor's *In His Presence* has come from the Religious Education Press (2s. 6d.): it is one of the most popular manuals of prayer and instruction for confirmation candidates. The Convent of St John Baptist, Clewer, has produced a mimeographed commentary on *The Great "O" Antiphons* by J. T. Abell (10s.): it is to be hoped that these splendid Advent antiphons will come into more general use, especially in cathedral and collegiate churches. Professor C. F. Evans's inaugural lecture at Durham—*Queen or Cinderella* (University of Durham, 2s. 6d.)—is a lively and

informative account and appraisal of the relations between Christian theology and historical methods of study during the past two centuries. It concludes as follows: "Maybe already theology, sitting by the kitchen hearth—for she has learnt like the rest of us in these days to take her meals in the kitchen—is beginning to cast appealing eyes in the direction of her old partner philosophy, but, so far, with little prospect of success. For philosophy is standing at the sink, and keeps his back resolutely turned. His dancing days, he says, are over, and he doubts whether it was ever anything but a child's pursuit. He must get on with his proper job, which, so far as one can see with his back turned, is to be scraping his pots and pans with the latest brand of detergent." Does not that make you want to know how the conclusion is reached? An article in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* May 1960, maintains that Roman Catholics are not bound to hold the traditional belief that the birth of Jesus was miraculous (*ex utero clauso*): see "La virginité de Marie et la naissance de Jésus" by J. Galot, S.J. The spring number of *The Anglican Catholic,* the quarterly gazette of the Anglican Society, contains a provocative article on "The Catholicism of the Church of England" (obtainable from 85 London Road, Teynham, Sittingbourne, Kent, 2s. 6d., post free).

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Roger Lloyd, *The Borderland* (16s.).

BURNS AND OATES: Paul Auvray, Pierre Poulain, Albert Blaise, *The Sacred Languages* (8s. 6d.); Henri Chambre, S.J., *Christianity and Communism* (8s. 6d.).

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY (for THE SENATE OF SERAMPORE): L. M. Schiff, *The Christian in Society* (Rs. 3).

CHURCH INFORMATION OFFICE: D. A. Hunter Johnston, *Money in Christian Life* (1s. 6d.); *Together in Britain* (3s.).

CLARENDON PRESS: Aileen Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship* (30s.); E. S. Drower, *The Secret Adam* (25s.).

T. AND T. CLARK: Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics,* Vol. III. *Doctrine of Creation,* Part 2 (55s.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: John D. Rayner, *Towards Mutual Understanding* (4s. 6d.).

DESCLÉE CO.: Claude Tresmontant, *A Study of Hebrew Thought* (Belg. Fr. 150).

DENNIS DOBSON: Eric Werner, *The Sacred Bridge* (90s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Frederic Greeves, *Theology and the Cure of Souls* (22s. 6d.); Leslie Davison (Ed.), *The Christian Replies* (2s. 6d.); Colin W. Williams, *John Wesley's Theology Today* (21s.).

GOLLANCZ: Donald A. Lowrie, *Rebellious Prophet* (25s.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: F. R. Barry, *Asking the Right Questions* (12s. 6d.).

MIRFIELD PUBLICATIONS: Andrew Blair, C.R., *The Warden's Trumpet: reflections on the Anglo-Presbyterian deadlock* (1s. 6d.).

PETER OWEN: Martin A. Larson, *The Religion of the Occident* (42s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Thorlief Boman, *Hebrew Thought compared with Greek* (21s.); John Bright, *A History of Israel* (40s.).

SHEED AND WARD: Arthur McCormack, *People, Space, Food* (9s.).

SKEFFINGTON: Gordon Huelin, *The Kingdom within you* (21s.); J. G. Davies, *The Making of the Church* (21s.).

SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY PRESS (EPWORTH PRESS): John Deschner, *Wesley's Christology* (30s.).

S.P.C.K.: Frank West, *The Country Parish To-day and To-morrow* (5s. 6d.); E. C. Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy* (30s.).

S.P.G.: *Taken at the Flood* [S.P.G. Annual Report] (1s. 6d.).

VALLENTINE, MITCHELL: Louis Jacobs, *Jewish Values* (21s.).

WEIDENFELD AND NICOLSON: E. O. James, *The Ancient Gods* (42s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON